arXiv:1609.07051v1 [q-fin.GN] 22 Sep 2016

Multivariate GARCH for a large number of stocks

Matthias Raddant[1,2] and Friedrich Wagner[3]

[1]Institute for the World Economy, Kiellinie 66, Kiel 24105, Germany
[2]Department of Economics, Kiel University, Olshausenstr. 40, 24118 Kiel, Germany, matthias.raddant@ifw-kiel.de
[3]Institute of Theoretical Physics, Kiel University, Leibnizstr. 19, Kiel 24098, Germany, wagner@theo-physik.uni-kiel.de

September 23, 2016

Abstract

The problems related to the application of multivariate GARCH models to a market with a large number of stocks are solved by restricting the form of the conditional covariance matrix. It contains one component describing the market and a second simple component to account for the remaining contribution to the volatility. This allows the analytical calculation of the inverse covariance matrix. We compare our model with the results of other GARCH models for the daily returns from the S&P500 market. The description of the covariance matrix turns out to be similar to the DCC model but has fewer free parameters and requires less computing time. As applications we use the daily values of β coefficients available from the market component to confirm a transition of the market in 2006. Further we discuss properties of the leverage effect.

1 Introduction

The estimation of co-movement between stocks is an essential problem in the analysis of asset returns, financial integration, and for portfolio management. On the one side, the statistical properties of asset returns necessitate to treat them in a setting where simultaneously time-varying volatility has to be modeled. This setting is the family of GARCH models.

Co-movement of asset returns on the other side is often involved with problems where the dimensionality of the problem is large – a feature that is at odds with many multivariate versions of GARCH models. In the following we present a new multivariate version of a GARCH model that can easily deal with a large number of assets from one market, and we show that the estimation results do not differ much from those of existing models. Hence our model provides a solution for the treatment of asset markets with a large number of constituents.

For an index or a single stock the so-called GARCH(1,1) model (Engle, 1982) has turned out to be very successful despite of its simplicity. The return

r_t at time t is written as a product of a factor $\sqrt{H_t}$ and an i.i.d. noise factor. H_t corresponds to the conditional expectation value $E_{t-1}[r_t^2]$. It obeys a linear recursion formula with three parameters related to the unconditional expectation value $\bar{H}$ of r_t^2, a time constant and a shape parameter describing the deviation from a Gaussian pdf for r_t. The model accounts for the stylized facts of returns (volatility clustering, fat tails) and allows to predict future volatility. Values of the parameters can be obtained by maximum likelihood estimates (MLE).

This univariate GARCH model has been generalized for N stocks. The multivariate version of the recursion becomes a matrix relation for the conditional covariance matrix H_t (see, e.g. Bauwens et al., 2006). These multivariate GARCH models face two difficulties in the case of large N. The first is related to the number of free parameters. Even in the scalar BEKK model (Engle and Kroner, 1995) the expectation value $\bar{H}$ of H_t contains $N(N+1)/2$ parameters which are difficult to estimate within MLE when applied, for example, to the entire set of S&P500 stocks. To avoid the large number of 'nuisance parameters' (Engle et al., 2008) covariance targeting has been proposed (Engle and Mezrich, 1996). In this case the matrix $\bar{H}$ is set to the time expectation value H_T of the covariance matrix. This reduces the number of parameters to two as in the DCC model of Engle (2002). However, for large N this method has to face another problem. When we analyze H_T for a time period of around $T = 4$ years or longer, we find that it can be described by one large eigenvalue in the order of N and a bulk of small eigenvalues, which can be described qualitatively by the Marchenko and Pastur (1967) spectrum originating from a random matrix. The difference between H_T and the true covariance matrix $\bar{H} = \lim_{T\to\infty} H_T$ is in the order of $\sqrt{N/T}$. This makes H_T not very reliable as estimator for $\bar{H}$.

The second problem for multivariate GARCH models is the computing time T_{comp} for large N. In each step of MLE the inverse matrix H_t^{-1} has to be calculated. This implies an increase of T_{comp} with N^3. In the application of the DCC model and the proposal of Engle et al. (2008) only correlations, resp. covariances between pairs of stocks are estimated. Using all pairs leads to $T_{comp} \propto N^2$. Selecting only N pairs as in Engle et al. (2008) one achieves $T_{comp} \propto N$. However, a selection based on alphabetic or random order makes it difficult to detect for example sectoral effects.

A computing time $T_{comp} \propto N$ is obtained in models which avoid computation of H_t^{-1} as the CCC (Bollerslev, 1986) or the OGARCH model (Alexander, 2001) by restricting the form of H_t. When we use the CCC model we assumes a constant correlation matrix that involves N univariate GARCH estimates for the diagonal elements of H_t. In the OGARCH model within a principal component analysis of H_t the eigenvectors are assumed to be time independent. The time dependent eigenvalues are determined by N univariate GARCH estimates that depend on the eigenmodes of the returns and which can be calculated outside MLE. Both models suffer from the fact that H_T will be badly determined when N is large.

In applications of OGARCH to foreign exchange or bond futures markets the largest two or three eigenvalues describe the the correlations relatively well. This approximation cannot be made in the case of stock markets. Constant

correlations in CCC or a constant leading eigenvector in OGARCH disagrees with the observed change in the latter (Raddant and Wagner, 2016).

We study a model that requires computing time for powers of H_t^α in the order of N. In application to large N we will use only well defined parts of H_T. This is achieved by using a restricted form of H_t with one large time dependent eigenvalue $Nv_0(t)$ and $N-1$ degenerate time dependent smaller eigenvalues $v_1(t)$. Hencce, in contrast to OGARCH the eigenvectors depend on time. A benefit of this approach is the possibility to interpret the eigenvector belonging to $Nv_0(t)$ as beta coefficients in the CAPM sense (Jensen et al., 1972) relative to the market (see also Raddant and Wagner, 2016). Since $H_t^{-1/2}$ can be easily calculated, other noise factors than Gaussian ones can be used.

The paper is organized in the following way. The derivation of the model is given in section 2. Similar to OGARCH we obtain two univariate GARCH models for the eigenvalues. In addition there will be a GARCH type recursion for the leading eigenvector $\beta(t)$. MLE fits using our model are applied to the daily returns of 356 stocks from the S&P market in the years 1997-2015 in section 3. In section 4 we compare our model with other GARCH models and data. In section 5 we utilize the fact that our model generates daily beta values and H_t for two applications: First we analyze how the H_ts have developed over time and we show when shifts of relative importance of sectors can be followed. As a second application we investigate the leverage effect, especially we look for any correlation with $\beta(t)$. The last section contains some conclusions.

2 MGARCH with restricted Covariance Matrix

We consider the returns r_{ti} of a financial market with N stocks $i = 1 \dots N$ in a time series $t = 1 \dots T$. In a GARCH model the returns are written as a product of the square root of the conditional covariance matrix $(H_t)_{ij} = E_{t-1}[r_{ti} r_{tj}]$ and a white noise with mean zero and variance one. In matrix notation[1] we have

$$r_t = {H_t}^{1/2} \cdot \eta_t \tag{1}$$

H_t obeys the linear recursion relation

$$H_{t+1} = H_t + \gamma(\bar{H} - H_t) + \alpha(r_t \cdot r_t' - H_t) \tag{2}$$

In principle α and γ can be matrices as in the vector MGARCH model (Engle, 2009) or depend on the stocks as in the BEKK model (Engle and Kroner, 1995). For large N there exist too many parameters to be estimated and also the numerical calculation of the inverse of H_t, necessary for maximum likelihood estimates, becomes a serious obstacle.

A solution consists in restricting the matrices H_t. A spectral decomposition for symmetric H_t reads

$$H_t = \sum_\nu \lambda_\nu(t)\ P_\nu(t) \tag{3}$$

[1]We use a' for the transpose of vector a. $a' \cdot b$ denotes the scalar and $a \cdot b'$ the tensor product. $M \cdot b$ denotes a matrix multiplication. r_t describes a vector (of stock returns) unless it is indexed otherwise.

with eigenvalues $\lambda_\nu(t)$ and projection matrices $P_\nu(t)$ given by the products of the eigenvectors. The advantage of using $P_\nu(t)$ instead of the latter is their independence of a particular choice of eigenvectors in the case of degenerated eigenvalues. A complete set of $P_\nu(t)$ obeys

$$P_\nu \cdot P_{\nu'} = \delta_{\nu\nu'} P_\nu \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_\nu P_\nu = 1 \tag{4}$$

Functions $f(H_t)$ can be computed utilizing that functions of matrices in equation (3) are functions of the eigenvalues when $\lambda_\nu(t)$ is replaced by $f(\lambda_\nu(t))$.

The restriction made in OGARCH consists in the assumption of time independent P_ν. Their calculation from the observed covariance matrix can be taken outside the estimation. The model is mostly applied to strongly correlated markets as foreign exchange or bond futures. In this case a few large eigenvalues are sufficient, which are determined by a univariate GARCH model. For stock markets this dominance is much less present and at least the leading eigenvector exhibits a substantial time variation (Raddant and Wagner, 2016). The restriction applied in our approach is a combination of methods used in OGARCH and the matrix BEKK model.

We keep the time dependence in the projector $P_0(t)$ on the leading eigenvalue and approximate the remaining eigenvalues by a degenerate spectrum. With a convenient normalization we assume the following form of H_t:

$$H_t = N \left(v_0(t)\ P_0(t)\ + \frac{v_1(t)}{N-1}\ P_1(t) \right) \tag{5}$$

with $P_1 = 1 - P_0$. The large eigenvalue $N v_0(t)$ and its projection matrix $P_0(t)$ can be interpreted as a market component. $P_0(t)$ can be expressed as a function of the eigenvector

$$P_0(t) = \frac{1}{N}\ \beta(t) \cdot \beta(t)', \tag{6}$$

assuming that β is normalized to $\beta^2 = N$. These β can be interpreted as beta coefficients in a CAPM approach (see also Jensen et al., 1972; Bollerslev et al., 1988) relative to the market return r_{Mt}

$$r_{Mt} = \frac{1}{N} \beta(t)' \cdot r_t. \tag{7}$$

When we insert (5) into the recursion (2) with scalar α and γ we would get two univariate recursions for $v_{0,1}(t)$ and a vector recursion for $\beta_i(t)$. However, having the same parameters α and γ in the three recursions is not the ideal choice. Since γ is related to the time behavior[2] of H_t reverting to its mean $\bar{H}$ we expect a smaller γ in the recursion of β than for $v_{0,1}(t)$. A nonzero α leads to a deviation of the pdf of returns from a Gaussian distribution. Universal α would imply similar distributions for all stocks, which does not account for the great variety of return pdf's for individual stocks.

Different shape and time parameters can be achieved by replacing α and γ in equation (2) by matrices analogues to the vector MGARCH model (Engle,

[2]This is the reason why we prefer the parameter $\gamma = 1 - \alpha - \beta$ over the usual parameter β.

2009). They project on the subspaces $P_{0,1}$. The generalization of equation (2) reads

$$H_{t+1} = H_t + \sum_{\nu,\nu'} P_\nu(t) \ \left[\alpha_{\nu\nu'}(r_t \cdot r_t' - H_t) + \gamma_{\nu\nu'}(\bar{H} - H_t)\right] \ P_{\nu'}(t) \qquad (8)$$

To preserve the symmetry of $(H_{t+1})_{ij}$ the 2x2 matrices α and γ have to be symmetric. With $\alpha_{\nu\nu'} = \alpha$ and $\gamma_{\nu\nu'} = \gamma$ we recover the scalar recursion of equation (2). If the off-diagonal elements in α and γ vanish we obtain a two component OGARCH model since β remains constant.

The derivation of the recursions for $v_\nu(t)$ and $\beta(t)$ given in the appendix is performed using linear algebra. Since the result given in equations (21) and (23) is rather complicated we illustrate them by quoting only the limit of large N and small deviations of $\beta(t)$ from its equilibrium value $\bar{\beta}$:

$$v_\nu(t+1) = v_\nu(t) + \gamma_{\nu\nu}\big(\bar{v}_\nu - v_\nu(t)\big) + \alpha_{\nu\nu}\left(\rho_\nu^2(t) - v_\nu(t)\right) \qquad (9)$$

Equation (9) corresponds to two univariate GARCH recursions depending on the combinations

$$\rho_0^2(t) = r_{Mt}^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_1^2(t) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_i \ r_{ti}^2 \ - \ r_{Mt}^2 \qquad (10)$$

of the observed returns. For β we obtain a GARCH type recursion for each component β_i:

$$\beta_i(t+1) = \beta_i(t) \ + \ \frac{\alpha_{10} \ r_{Mt}}{v_0(t+1)}\big(r_{ti} - r_{Mt}\beta_i(t)\big) \ + \ \frac{\gamma_{10} \ \bar{v}_0}{v_0(t+1)}\left(\bar{\beta}_i - \beta_i(t)\right) \qquad (11)$$

Equation (11) shows that $\beta(t)$ change only if the stock returns r_{ti} differ from the market return r_{Mt} and $\beta_i(t)$ from the equilibrium values $\bar{\beta}_i$. Their values and the equilibrium values $\bar{v}_\nu$ of $v_\nu(t)$ are determined from the observed covariance matrix using only the properties of the leading eigenvalue. As shown in Raddant and Wagner (2016) they can be estimated with an error of order $1/\sqrt{T}$. The 'covariance targeting' problem leading to errors of order $\sqrt{N/T}$ does not appear in contrast to other GARCH models.

3 Estimation of the parameters with S&P data

In this section we describe the maximum likelihood estimation with data of daily returns of 356 stocks from the S&P market in the years 1995-2013. For our analysis we use data from Thompson Reuters on the closing price of stocks which were continuously traded with sufficient volume throughout the sample period and had a meaningful market capitalization.[3]

We calculate the log likelihood L of our model as described in equations (21) and (23) of the appendix. In a first fit we use only two parameters with $\alpha_{\nu\nu'} = \alpha_{00}$ and $\gamma_{\nu\nu'} = \gamma_{00}$. The noise is assumed to be Gaussian.

[3]We excluded stocks which price did not change for more then 8 % of the trading days, or which were exempt from trading or for which no trading was recorded for more than 10 days in a row. We manually deleted 15 stocks which price movements at some point showed similarities to penny stocks and/or which market capitalization was very low.

number of parameters	L/T	$\alpha_{00} \cdot 10^2$	$\gamma_{00} \cdot 10^2$	$\alpha_{11} \cdot 10^1$	$\gamma_{11} \cdot 10^2$	$\alpha_{10} \cdot 10^2$	$\gamma_{10} \cdot 10^2$
2	-52.12	4.87(6)	0.38(1)	α_{00}	γ_{00}	α_{00}	γ_{00}
2	-2.532	3.13(5)	0.28(1)	α_{00}	γ_{00}	α_{00}	γ_{00}
4	-0.088	1.59(4)	0.33(2)	2.47(7)	0.77(8)	α_{00}	γ_{00}
6	0.001	5.10(3)	4.10(3)	2.45(4)	0.78(7)	1.67(4)	0.30(2)

Table 1: *Maximum likelihood estimates with the S&P returns. Errors (brackets) are 5% confidence levels taken from the larger value of either the error matrix (inverse Hessian) or a change of the log likelihood $\Delta L = -1$. The results in the top row are obtained by using Gaussian noise, results in row 2–4 are obtained with Student's-t noise.*

The resulting log likelihood divided by T and the parameter values are given in table 1. When we invert equation (1) we can obtain the so-called de-garched returns $\eta_G(t)$.

$$\eta_G(t) = H_t^{-1/2} \cdot r_t \tag{12}$$

If the GARCH model represents the data exactly, $\eta_G(t)$ should be again Gaussian distributed. This is not the case, as the pdf for all $\eta_G(t)_i$ given in figure 1 shows. The pdf for $\eta_G(t)$ is well described by a Student's t-distribution with a tail index of $\nu = 3.32$.

This motivates to repeat the fitting and to replace the noise by a Student's t-distribution with a fitted value. The resulting L (2^{nd} line in table 1) corresponds to an increase of probability of $10^{90,000}$. This sensitivity to the noise is not observed in application of univariate GARCH models to indices, where a change of η can be compensated by an adjustment of the shape parameter α. It has been observed from a non-parametric moment analysis that stocks require a noise different from that of indices (Wagner et al., 2010). In our restricted matrix GARCH model (hereafter called RMG) α does not depend on individual stocks. Therefore the compensation cannot occur. The only stock dependence comes from β, which are mainly determined by the covariance and not by the shape. To compare the pdf for returns in univariate GARCH models a Monte Carlo simulation could be made. Simulating RMG is not very meaningful since stocks enter only via the mean values $\bar{\beta}$. Instead we use the possibility of GARCH to predict returns from equation (1) for given H_t with repeated noise factors η. Neglecting the small violation of time reversal in GARCH the pdf of these predictions should agree qualitatively with the observed pdf.

In figure 1 two typical pdf's of returns are compared with the predicted density either using Student's t (black line) or Gaussian (red line) noise. The latter describes the tails but fails in the transition to the tail, which may be the reason for the difference in probability. In all subsequent estimates we use the fitted value of $\nu = 3.25$. Still the time dependence described by γ_0 is not satisfactory.

The value $\gamma_{00}^{-1} = 339$ *days* exceeds the value needed from the autocorrelation of $|r_{Mt}|$ by an order of magnitude. A four parameter fit with $\alpha_{10} = \alpha_{00}$ and $\gamma_{10} = \gamma_{00}$ improves the likelihood (third line in table 1), but does not solve



Figure 1: *Left part gives pdf of all GARCH filtered returns $\eta_G(t)_i$ obtained from the raw returns by eq (12). In the right part two typical pdf for stocks of the S&P market compared with the predicted pdf using Student's (black) or Gaussian (red) noise*

the problem. Only when all six parameters are varied (fourth line), the time constant for β is much smaller than for $v_{0,1}$ together with an again improved probability.

Our RMG rests on the simple form of equation (5). This leads for the observed correlation matrix to an eigenvalue spectrum which is the sum of one large eigenvalue of order N and a random matrix component described by a Marchenko and Pastur (1967) spectrum. This describes qualitatively the observations. The RMG is distinguished by a small number of parameters and analytical calculation of H_t^{-1}, which makes it applicable also for a large number of stocks. It allows separation of a market component with economical meaningful β coefficients and r_t on the same time scale as $v(t)$.



Figure 2: *Market volatility $\sqrt{v_0(t)}$ (top) and market return $|r_{Mt}|$ (bottom). A value of 2 is added to $\sqrt{v_0(t)}$*



Figure 3: *Autocorrelation for returns $|r_{ti}|$ averaged over all stocks (top) and the averaged GARCH filtered returns $|\eta_G(ti)|$*

As in any GARCH model one finds volatilities much less noisy than the

absolute returns. This is shown in figure 2 where the market volatility $\sqrt{v_0(t)}$ is compared with the underlying market return r_{Mt}. Another interesting effect is shown in figure 3, where we compare the autocorrelation for the GARCH filtered returns $|\eta_G(ti)|$ with $|r_{ti}|$ averaged over all stocks i. The former has much smaller correlations on a time scale of years. The large statistics allow even to resolve the peaks at multiple of three months due to the market activity.

4 Comparison with other GARCH models

In the following we will compare the estimation results of our model with those of other multivariate GARCH models. We start by comparing the predicted pdf of stock returns with the six parameter model discussed in section 3 with the CCC and OGARCH model (hereafter abbreviated with OG). The CCC model uses a constant correlation matrix supplemented with N univariate GARCH for r_{ti}. In OG we include all eigenmodes $P_\nu \cdot r_t$, where the constant projectors P_ν are obtained from $\bar{H}$ by covariance targeting. In both we use i.i.d. Gaussian η for the noise. The left part of figure 4 shows that the pdf for the same two stocks as in figure 1 is in reasonable agreement with the three models. RMG and OG fail in cases where the leading eigenvector does not dominate H_t, as the third example for PG&E shows.


RMG (red), CCC (blue), OG (orange)
HEWLETT−PACKARD
DEERE
PG & E
log(f)
|r|
χ² distribution for RMG (red), CCC (blue), OG (orange)
last red bin 11 stocks with χ² > 40
last orange bin 9 stocks with χ² > 40
χ²/nd

Figure 4: *Left part gives pdf returns compared with the prediction of RMG (black), UVG (blue) and OG (red). Left part gives the histogram of χ^2 for all stocks from RMG (red) , OG and UVG(white)*

For a more comprehensive comparison we use the χ^2/n_d ratio equal to the sum of quadratic deviation in units of the squared error divided by the number n_d of bins. A histogram of these ratios from the 356 stocks of the S&P market is shown for RMG, OG and CCC in the right part of figure 4.

CCC consists in a benchmark test which level of agreement could be achieved. All three distributions exhibit a peak around a value of 4-5 which corresponds to a 5% confidence level. Values between 10-20 lead still to a qualitative description. In contrast to CCC both RMG and OG have a small fraction 5% of outliers mainly from the energy sector as PG&E. On average



Figure 5: *Distributions of deviation of different H_t time series. We calculate the RMSD for all pairs of time series of estimated covariances and plot the histogram for the deviation of the time series derived from RMG, CCC, and OG versus the DCC model. We observe that RMG and CCC produce H_t that are relatively similar to DCC, while the difference to OG is large and more heterogeneous among the different covariances.*

RMG performs better than OG which may be due to the systematic error by covariance targeting. We stress that in CCC and OG 712 parameter have to be determined. The only six parameter used in RMG lead to a much more parsimonious description of the data.

Another way of assessing the results is of course the comparison of the estimated H_ts with those obtained from the other models. In the following we use the DCC model as a benchmark and compare the resulting time series of covariances. We use 10 day averages. For the DCC and the OG we estimate the model repeatedly with 10 different stocks, since an estimation with the entire data set is not possible.

Figure 5 shows a histogram of RMSDs of pairwise comparisons of time series of estimated covariances. The figure shows similarities to the previous results, but now the DCC model serves as a benchmark. The deviations between DCC and our model are smallest, slightly better than the CCC model, the difference between DCC and the OG model is much larger. Interestingly the constant conditional correlations seems to work better than assuming constant principal components, especially in the long run.

It is also interesting to analyze which stocks are responsible for most of the deviations. A sectoral break-down of the results, shown in figure 6 reveals some patterns. The RMG describes most of the stocks well, but has slight problems with stocks from the energy sector, which are probably not always well described by our model, since they are not very representative for the market trend. A similar observation can be made for CCC. In this case however part of the deviation also stems from the IT sector.



Figure 6: *Deviation from DCC results by sector. We calculate the RMSD for all pairs of H_t time series and calculate the average RMSD for covariances of stocks from specific sectors. We plot these averages as color-coded values for the deviation of the H_t time series for RMG, CCC, and OG versus the DCC model. We observe that differences in the estimated covariances stem from specific sectors, especially energy, IT, and the financial sector.*

In the next section we will show that the average correlation in the IT sector has slightly declined - against the general trend, which might explain this finding. In fact the OG model seems to have problems with all stocks that come from sectors where we have seen changes of relative importance or volatility over time.

5 Applications

5.1 Market transition

The large number of stocks in our sample allows to search for group specific regularities. An obvious question is if the correlations that can be extracted from the H_t differ for stocks from specific sectors, and more interestingly, how they develop over time. Our sample period covers a time period during which we have seen pronounced changes in the market, namely the IT bubble, the financial crisis, and the growing importance of energy markets.

For this reason we use the estimated H_ts and then derive correlation matrices C_t such that

$$C_t = D^{-1} H_t D^{-1} \tag{13}$$

where D is the square root of the matrix with the main diagonal elements of H_t. We can use these correlations to calculate the median correlation for pairs of stocks from specific sectors (GICS classification).



Figure 7: *Development of median correlation by sector, averaged over 50 days. We show the average of all stock correlations (bold grey line), as well as some of the sectors with the strongest correlations. The sector with the strongest inter-sector correlation has for a long time been the IT sector (blue), later the financial sector (red) has taken over this role.*

Figure 7 shows some of these median correlations. We observe very high average within sector correlation for stocks in the IT and financial sector. But also some correlations between stocks of different sectors are rather high, for example when the consumer or materials sectors are involved.



Figure 8: *Time dependence of the risk parameter described in equation (14) for the sectors of the S&P market. The dashed line shows the result of Raddant and Wagner (2016). The solid lines (blue for the information technology and red for the financial sector) use daily βs from the RMG.*

In general we observe two important changes. First, the overall level of correlations has shifted upwards from 2002 until 2007. The second observation is that the ranking between the sectors has changed, the financial sector surpasses the IT sector in terms of correlation around 2006.

These changes can be analyzed in more detail. In the analysis of Raddant and Wagner (2016) of the US, the UK, and the German stock market the same change has been found in the behavior based on the stock's beta values. In the years 1994-2006 trades of stocks with high beta and large volume were concentrated in the information technology sector, whereas in 2006-2012 those trades are dominated by stocks from the financial sector. The values of the β have been derived under the assumption that the covariance matrix of the returns have a large eigenvalue already at window sizes of 3 years. Since a $\beta > 1$ signals a risky investment, a market risk measure $R(t, s)$ has been defined for the sectors by multiplying $\beta_i > 1$ with the number $V(t, i)$ of traded shares in each window.

$$R(t, s) = A_S \sum_{i \epsilon s} \theta(\beta_i - 1.0)\beta_i(t)\, V(t, i) \tag{14}$$

The normalization constant A_S is chosen to have $\sum_s R(t, s) = 1$. When we apply this measure we see that before 2006 only the information technology sector and after 2006 only the financial sector exhibit large values of the risk measure.

However, the time and the duration of this transition had a systematic error of 1.5 years due to the window size. Repeating R with the β from RMG serves two purposes. Firstly it is a check whether in RMG the market property can be reproduced and secondly the transition time can be determined more accurately, since daily β are known from RMG. To reduce the noise on β we average $R(t, s)$ over one month. In figure 8 the risk parameters from equation

(14) for the S&P market is shown as a function of time. The agreement with the previous determination (dashed lines) is good. With a time resolution of one month we can now safely say that the transition happens during the year 2006.

5.2 Leverage effect

The leverage effect consists in a negative correlation between volatility and future returns (Black, 1976). It is a relatively small effect (Schwert, 1989), but important for estimation of risk. Since GARCH models provide a measurement of the daily volatility they are well suited for an analysis of this effect.



Figure 9: *Asymmetry of r vs $\bar{\beta}$ for stocks. Blue diamonds refer to technology, red stars to financials. The line corresponds to average $\bar{\beta}$ and stdev.*



Figure 10: *Asymmetry of η vs $\bar{\beta}$ for stocks. Blue diamonds refer to technology, red stars to financials. The line corresponds to average $\bar{\beta}$ and stdev.*

In a first step we determine for each stock the time correlation $C_i(t)$ between the market volatility v_0 and the observed returns r_{ti}:

$$C_i(t) = \frac{1}{N_C} \sum_{t'} \left(v_0(t'-t) - \bar{v_0} \right) r_{t'i} \tag{15}$$

with the normalization factor $N_C^2 = T \cdot var(v_0) \sum_t r_{ti}^2$. The stocks lead to a large variety of functions $C_i(t)$, although they exhibit the leverage effect in the sense of negative values of $C_i(t) \cdot sign(t)$. Therefore we use the asymmetry defined by

$$A_i = \frac{1}{t_m} \sum_{t=1}^{t_m} \left(C_i(t) - C_i(-t) \right) \tag{16}$$

with a maximum of the time lag t_m of two months. A_i corresponds to the difference in the area under $C(t)$ for positive and negative t.

It has been suggested by Black that the leverage effect is related to risk. To test this suggestion we show in figure 9 the asymmetry as a function of the mean value $\bar{\beta}_i$. Since $\beta(t)$ changes around 2006 we use two time series in the years from 1984 to 2005 and from 2007 to 2013. The asymmetries are clearly negative and increase slightly with $\bar{\beta}$ as indicated by the line connecting the mean of A.

If our RMG describes the data successfully the leverage effect should disappear by replacing r_{ti} by the GARCH filtered returns $\eta_G(t)_i$ in equation (15). As shown in figure 10 this is in fact the case. The GARCH filtered returns have little autocorrelation and no significant leverage effect.

We conclude this section with a remark on predictions. These cannot be made using our RMG. For prediction of future returns the leverage effect has to be included in the recursion. Analogous to the GJR-Garch model (Glosten et al., 1993) an additional matrix proportional to $\delta_{ij} r_{ti}|r_{ti}|$ can be added on the RHS of equation (8). For large N the recursions for v_0 and β are unchanged. Only v_1 is affected. We repeated the fit including such a term. The likelihood improves, however the values of α and γ are inside the errors the same. Also the results contained in figures 9 and 10 remain the same.

6 Conclusions

In our GARCH model we use a two component form of the conditional covariance matrix H which avoids inversion of H and the problems of covariance targeting. The resulting H turns out to be similar as that of the DCC model. Apart from a small number of parameters and a computing time $T_{comp} \propto N$ our RMG has the advantage that daily β values relative to the market are determined. In contrast to other studies we found that by replacing the Gaussian by a Student's t-distributed noise improves the likelihood substantially.

As an application we study a possible transition of the S&P market in 2006 observed earlier by (Raddant and Wagner, 2016). We repeated this analysis with a better time resolution using the $\beta(t)$ from RMG and found the same result. A second application refers to the time correlation between returns r_{ti} and the volatility (leverage effect). When one replaces r_{ti} by the de-garched returns $\eta_{Gi}(t)$ the leverage effect disappears.

References

Carol Alexander. A primer on the orthogonal GARCH model. *mimeo*, 2001.

Luc Bauwens, Sébastien Laurent, and Jeroen V.K. Rombouts. Multivariate GARCH models: a survey. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 21(1):79–109, 2006.

Fischer Black. Studies of stock market volatility changes. *Proceedings of the American Statistical Association, Business and Economic Statistics Section*, pages 177–181, 1976.

Tim Bollerslev. Generalized autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity. *Journal of Econometrics*, 31:307–327, 1986.

Tim Bollerslev, Robert F. Engle, and Jeffry M. Wooldridge. A capital asset pricing model with time-varying covariances. *Journal of Political Economy*, 96(1):116–131, 1988.

Robert F. Engle. Autoregressive conditional heteroscedasticity with estimates of the variance of United Kingdom inflation. *Econometrica*, 50(4):987–1007, 1982.

Robert F. Engle. Dynamic conditional correlation: A simple class of multivariate generalized autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity models. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 20(3):339–350, 2002.

Robert F. Engle. *Anticipating correlations*. Princeton UP, 2009.

Robert F. Engle and F.K. Kroner. Multivariate simultaneous generalized ARCH. *Economic Theory*, 11:122–150, 1995.

Robert F. Engle and J. Mezrich. GARCH for groups. *Risk*, 9:36–40, 1996.

Robert F. Engle, Neil Shephard, and Kevin Sheppard. Fitting vast dimensional time-varying covariance models. NYU Working Paper FIN-08-009, NYU, 2008.

Lawrence R. Glosten, Ravi Jagannathan, and David E. Runkle. On the relation between the expected value and the volatility of the nominal excess return on stocks. *The Journal of Finance*, 48(5):1779–1801, 1993.

Michael C. Jensen, Fischer Black, and Myron S. Scholes. The capital asset pricing model. some empirical tests in studies in the theory of capital markets. In MC Jensen, editor, *Studies in the theory of capital markets*. New York, Praeger Publishers., 1972.

V. A. Marchenko and L. A. Pastur. Distribution of eigenvalues for some sets of random matrices. *Mat. Sb. (N.S.)*, 72(114)(4):507–536, 1967.

Matthias Raddant and Friedrich Wagner. Transitions in the stock markets of the US, UK and Germany. *Quantitative Finance*, forthcoming, 2016.

G. William Schwert. Why does stock market volatility change over time? *The Journal of Finance*, 44(5):1115–1153, 1989.

Friedrich Wagner, Mishael Milakovic, and Simone Alfarano. What distinguishes individual stocks from the index? *Eur. Phys. J. B*, 73:23–28, 2010.

Appendix: Derivation of the Recursions

In the recursion equation (8) we separate the off-diagonal elements in α and γ

$$\begin{aligned} H_{t+1} &= H_t + \sum_{\nu=0,1} P_\nu(t) \cdot \left[\alpha_{\nu\nu}(r_t \cdot r_t' - H_t) + \gamma_{\nu\nu}(\bar{H} - H_t)\right] \cdot P_\nu(t) \qquad (17) \\ &+ P_0(t) \cdot \left[\alpha_{10}(r_t \cdot r_t' + \gamma_{10}\bar{H}\right] \cdot P_1(t) \; + \; P_1(t) \cdot \left[\alpha_{10}(r_t \cdot r_t' + \gamma_{10}\bar{H}\right] \cdot P_0(t) \end{aligned}$$

we notice that $\beta(t+1)$ is obtained from $\beta(t)$ by a rotation on the N dimensional sphere with an angle φ

$$\beta(t+1) = \cos\varphi \; \beta(t) \; + \; \sin\varphi \; \Delta \qquad (18)$$

with $\Delta^2 = N$ and $\Delta' \cdot \beta(t) = 0$. Inserting (18) into H_{t+1} we get

$$\frac{1}{N} tr[H_{t+1} \cdot P_\nu(t)] = v_\nu(t+1) - (-)^\nu \sin^2\varphi \; A(t+1) \qquad (19)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{N}[H_{t+1} \cdot \beta(t)]_i = v_0(t+1)\beta_i(t) + \sin\varphi \; A(t+1)(\cos\varphi \; \Delta_i - \sin\varphi \beta_i(t)) \qquad (20)$$

with the abbreviation $A(t+1) = v_0(t+1) - v_1(t+1)/(N-1)$. Applying $\frac{1}{N} tr[P_\nu(t)$ onto the r.h.s of equation (17) we obtain the recursions for $v_\nu(t+1)$ with $\bar{\alpha}_\nu = 1 - \alpha_{\nu\nu} - \gamma_{\nu\nu}$

$$v_\nu(t+1) - (-)^\nu \sin^2\varphi \; A(t+1) = \bar{\alpha}_\nu \; v_\nu(t) + \alpha_{\nu\nu}\rho_\nu^2(t) + \gamma_{\nu\nu}\frac{1}{N} tr[\bar{H} \cdot P_\nu(t)] \qquad (21)$$

where the observed returns appear in the combinations given by equation (10). We denote application of $\beta(t)_i/N$ on the r.h.s. of equation (17) by D_i. D_i is given by

$$D_i = \alpha_{10} r_{Mt}(r_{ti} - \beta_i(t) r_{Mt}) + \frac{\gamma_{10}}{N}\left([\bar{H} \cdot \beta(t)]_i - \beta_i(t) tr[\bar{H} \cdot P_0]\right)$$

Setting D_i equal to equation (20) and using equation (21) we find an expression for Δ

$$\sin 2\varphi \; A(t+1) \; \Delta_i = 2D_i \qquad (22)$$

Due to $\Delta^2 = N$ equation (22) allows to express φ in terms of $A(t+1)$ and quantities known at t. Then from equation (21) $v_\nu(t+1)$ can be computed. It is interesting to note that $\beta(t)' \cdot D$ holds. Therefore the recursion (17) preserves the norm of β. For the recursion for $\beta(t+1)$ we finally get

$$\beta_i(t+1) = \cos\varphi \; \beta_i(t) + \frac{1}{A(t+1)\cos\varphi} D_i \qquad (23)$$

For the terms involving the unconditional expectation values $\bar{H}$ we use a decomposition analogues to H_t

$$\bar{H} = \left(\bar{v}_0 - \frac{\bar{v}_1}{N-1}\right) \bar{\beta} \cdot \bar{\beta}' \; + \; \frac{N}{N-1}\bar{v}_1 \cdot 1 \qquad (24)$$

Only the leading eigenvalue $N\bar{v}_0$, its eigenvector $\bar{\beta}$ and $tr[\bar{H}] = N(\bar{v}_0 + \bar{v}_1)$ are needed. As shown in Raddant and Wagner (2016) these terms can be extracted from the observed covariance matrix with statistical error of order $1/\sqrt{T}$. In the recursions the following expressions are required

$$\frac{1}{N} tr[\bar{H} \cdot P_\nu(t)] = \bar{v}_\nu - (-)^\nu (1 - m^2)\bar{A} \tag{25}$$

$$\frac{1}{N} [\bar{H} \cdot \beta(t)]_i = m\bar{A}\bar{\beta}_i + \frac{\bar{v}_1}{N-1}\beta_i(t) \tag{26}$$

with $\bar{A} = \bar{v}_0 - \bar{v}_1/(N-1)$ and $m = \bar{\beta}' \cdot \beta(t)/N$ denoting the overlap between $\beta(t)$ and $\bar{\beta}$. For the recursion initial values are needed. These are obtained in a similar way as $\bar{v}_\nu$ and $\bar{\beta}$ from the covariance matrix determined in the first four years.

The log likelihood with noise distribution $f(\eta)$ can be computed using

$$\eta = {H_t}^{-1/2} \cdot r_t \tag{27}$$

With the spectral decomposition for H_t we obtain

$$\eta = \frac{r_{Mt}}{\sqrt{N v_0(t)}}\, \beta \; + \; \sqrt{\frac{N-1}{N v_1(t)}}\, (r_t - r_{Mt}\beta) \tag{28}$$

The log likelihood L is given up to an uninteresting constant by

$$L = \frac{1}{2} \sum_t \left[\sum_i \ln f(\eta_i) - \ln v_0(t) - (N-1) \ln v_1(t) \right] \tag{29}$$

For Gaussian noise calculation of the $\ln(f)$ can be avoided. The complication of using a Student t distribution leads to an negligible increase of computing time compared to the calculation of $v_n(t)$) and $\beta(t)$. In any case the computing time increases only with $T * N$.